

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,749	03/25/2004	Brian Robert Prasky	POU920030065US1	7321
33558 INTERNATIO	7590 10/21/200 NAL BUSINESS MAC	EXAMINER		
IPLAW DEPARTMENT			FENNEMA, ROBERT E	
2455 SOUTH ROAD - MS P386 POUGHKEEPSIE, NY 12601			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		2183	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/809,749	PRASKY ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
ROBERT E. FENNEMA	2183		

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 24 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. A The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of thi application, application, applicant must timely file one of the following replices: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal flee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time
periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. If no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 760 507(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 3° CPR1.17(a) is calculated form: (1) the expiration date of the shortened saturoty period for enjoy ofiginally set in file of Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any armed patent term adjustment. See 3° CPR 1.70(4).
NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. Lighe Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) \( \text{They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);} \( (b) \( \text{M} \) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);} \)
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>
7. 🔯 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) 🔯 will not be entered, or b) 🔲 will be entered and an explanation of
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8.10-18.20-28 and 30</u> .
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. \(\overline{\text{Z}}\) The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  Appulicant has argued on Pages 15-16 of the remarks that the Examiner has stated that the prior art "would have not only turner."
the fetching mechanism off, that action would have disabled the branch history ptable and the branch target buffer", and that the
claimed subject matter does not operate like the prior art, because it does not stop fetching or decoding. First of all, Examiner notes that there is no recitation anywhere in the claim language to suggest such a thing, so there is nothing that prevents the
claimed invention from stopping fetching and decoding. However, Examiner also notes that the Examiner said no such thing
regarding the stopping of fetching, and Examiner can find absolutely record where he stated that the prior art would stop fetching or anything even remotely related to such a statement that could possibly be interpreted as such. Therefore, EXaminer is not
persuaded by the Applicant's arguments, as they not only do not appear to be represented in the claims, but appear to be based
on a statement by the Examiner which is not present on the record.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).
13. Other:

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

/Eddie P Chan/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2183

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Part of Paper No. 20081010

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to the claim change the scope of the branch history table, by indicating that the branch history table, and the proper open of the claim. Furthermore, such amendments do not put the claims in condition for allowance, and do not reduce the issues for appeal, therefore it is not proper to enter the amendment. Additionally, Examiner notes that the current amendment to the specification appears to remove material from the background section of the disclosure, and move it into the summary of claimed subject materials. Since Applicant cannot remove any material from the background which an actual disclosure of prior art, in order for this amendment to be proper, Applicant is required to show or explain why Paragraph 12 from the background was not a disclosure of prior art, as in the context of the specification, it appears that it to ould be.